Applicant(s) Application No.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  (1) Mr. Amir Behnia (3)  (2) Mr. Clark Dexter (4)  Date of Interview Jan 3, 2003  Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c X  Personal (copy is given to 11  applicant 2 X  applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) X  No. If yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: all in general, specifically claim 21  Identification of prior art discussed:  None  Agreement with respect to the claims      was reached.    g)    was not reached.    h X  N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Benhia proposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 discussed in the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examiner stated that this proposed amendment and similar amendments in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejections. Mr. Benhia further inquired as to whether the claims previously indicated as allowable were still considered to be allowable since no indication of such was given in the previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated that while further consideration would be put to all of the claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims indicated as allowable, specifically claims 1, 12-19 and 21-34, are still considered to be allowable over the prior art of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims added, specifically claims 35-80. Sand S4, must be considered separately and may require an additional search and will require independent consideration with respect to the prior art.  IA fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, a summary thereof must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, a summary thereof must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the cla	Interview Summary	09/115,654	5	Shibata
(1) Mr. Amir Behnia (3)  (2) Mr. Clark Dexter (4)  Date of Interview Jan 3, 2003  Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conference c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) □ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: all in general, specifically claim 21  Identification of prior art discussed:  None  Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Benhia praposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the ourstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 discussed in the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examiner stated that this proposed amendment and similar amendments in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejections. Mr. Benhia further inquired as to whether the claims previously indicated as allifulcants dered to be allowable since no indication of such as given in the previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated that while further consideration would be given to all of the claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims indicated as allowable, specifically claims 1, 12-19 and 21-34, are still considered to be allowable over the prior and of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims added, specifically claims 35-50. 53 and 54, must be considered separately and may require an additional search and will require independent consideration with respect to the prior and of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has				24
Date of Interview	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	) personnel):		
Date of Interview	(1) Mr. Amir Behnia	(3)		
Type: a	(2) Mr. Clark Dexter			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	Date of Interview Jan 3, 2003	_		
Identification of prior art discussed:  None  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Benhia proposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 discussed in the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examiner stated that this proposed amendment and similar amendments in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejections. Mr. Benhia further inquired as to whether the claims reviously indicated as allowable were still considered to be allowable since no indication of such was given in the previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated that while further consideration would be given to all of the claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims indicated as allowable, specifically claims 1, 12-19 and 21-34, are still considered to be allowable over the prior art of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims added, specifically claims 35-50, 53 and 54, must be considered separately and may require an additional search and will require independent consideration with respect to the prior art.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has	c)  ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant			
Identification of prior art discussed:  None  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Benhia proposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 discussed in the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examiner stated that this proposed amendment and similar amendments in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejections. Mr. Benhia further inquired as to whether the claims previously indicated as allowable were still considered to be allowable since no indication of such was given in the previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated that while further consideration would be given to all of the claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims indicated as allowable, specifically claims 1, 12-19 and 21-34, are still considered to be allowable over the prior art of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims added, specifically claims 35-50, 53 and 54, must be considered separately and may require an additional search and will require independent consideration with respect to the prior art.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has	Claim(s) discussed: all in general, specifically claim 21			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Benhia proposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 discussed in the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examiner stated that this proposed amendment and similar amendments in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejections. Mr. Benhia further inquired as to whether the claims previously indicated as allowable were still considered to be allowable since no indication of such was given in the previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated that while further consideration would be given to all of the claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims indicated as allowable, specifically claims 1, 12-19 and 21-34, are still considered to be allowable over the prior art of record. Mr. Dexter stated that the large number of new claims added, specifically claims 35-50, 53 and 54, must be considered separately and may require an additional search and will require independent consideration with respect to the prior art.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has	Identification of prior art discussed:			
already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE	Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments:  Mr. Benhia proposed an amended claim 21 to obviate the miscellaneous Office action (paper no. 26). The Examine in the applicable claims would obviate the "112" rejection previously indicated as allowable were still considered to previous Office action (paper no. 24). Mr. Dexter stated claims upon receipt of applicant's response, the claims instill considered to be allowable over the prior art of record specifically claims 35-50, 53 and 54, must be considered independent consideration with respect to the prior art.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amenallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepunction. Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMINCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See M.)	al nature of what was a outstanding rejection of stated that this proposes. Mr. Benhia further be allowable since no in that while further considicated as allowable, so d. Mr. Dexter stated the separately and may respect to the amendments which the example of the substantial state of the substan	agreed to if an agree ander 35 USC 112 deserment and inquired as to whether adication of such was ideration would be goedifically claims 1, at the large number quire an additional such as that would render that the that would render that would render that would render that would render that a reply to the last	Iscussed in the Isimilar amendments er the claims as given in the viven to all of the 12-19 and 21-34, are of new claims added, earch and will require render the claims allowable is ew (if box is checked). CE ACTION MUST Office action has

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.